UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,339	09/19/2007	Eric Lenglet	PET-2269	9511
23599 7590 11/09/2009 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			EXAMINER	
			PO, MING CHEUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@mwzb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/591,339	LENGLET ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MING CHEUNG PO	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 S This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	awn from consideration. or election requirement.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the E	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112/101

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 1 recites the limitation in line 25-26 that "the vacuum residue content with a sulphur content of more than 1% by weight which is zero or reduced by at least 15% with respect to the oil P1." It is unclear what this phrase means.
- 4. Claims 1-16 provide for the use of a purified field gas, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Art Unit: 1797

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BROWN (US 4,885,080).

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 18, BROWN teaches a process for fractionating a heavy crude oil into at least 3 liquid fractions. The process is described in lines 25 - 53 of column 3 to vacuum or atmospheric fractionating a heavy crude charge stock into 3 liquid fractions: a naphtha cut of C5 - 400°F, a distillate cut having an atmospheric pressure boiling range of about 400°F to about 650°F and a heavy residuum boiling at a temperature pf at least 650°F. The residuum is fed to a hydrodemetallation unit where the residuum is fed to hydrometallization and desulfurized over a suitable catalyst. BROWN teaches an example from lines 45 - 68 of column 8 and lines 1 - 68 of column 9. The examples use HONDA off-shore California heavy crude oil, with a pour point of -10° F. The crude oil is separated into a residuum, distillate fraction and naphtha fraction. The atmospheric residuum is taught to have 6.06 weight percent sulfur (vacuum residue with a sulphur content of more than 1% by weight) and 475 total ppm of nickel and vanadium metal. The distillate fraction contains 2.9 weight percent **sulfur.** The residuum is discharged into a hydrometallation reactor where is it commingled with hydrogen and demetallized with a sulfur content of 1.3 weight percent.

Art Unit: 1797

. (at least one desulphurizing treatment step of at least a fraction of the oil, and fraction mainly comprising compounds with a boiling point of more than 343°C, said step consuming at least a fraction of the H₂). In the demetallation reactor hydrogen sulfide and ammonia is produced (reducing the quantity of vacuum residue). The distillate fraction is charged to a hydrodesulfurization reactor and commingled with hydrogen and leaves the reactor with 0.15 weight percent sulfur (at least one pre-refined oil being substantially free of asphaltenes, having a sulphur content that is reduced by at least 50%.

BROWN does not seem to explicitly teach where the treatment takes place and further evacuation of the pre-refined oil to an oil port.

However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to refine prerefined oil PA in an oil refinery distinct and distant from the site of the production of the
pre-refined oil, since applicant has not disclosed that the location of the refinement
solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the
invention would perform equally well with refining the pre-refined oil PA in an oil refinery
anywhere.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MING CHEUNG PO whose telephone number is (571)270-5552. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

Art Unit: 1797

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571)272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ming Cheung Po/ Patent Examiner

/Ellen M McAvoy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797